

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 171

JC 900 572

AUTHOR Seppanen, Loretta
TITLE Washington Community College Faculty Development
Survey Results: A Summary of the Results of Survey of
All Full-Time Faculty. Operations Report No. 90-3.
INSTITUTION Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education,
Olympia.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical
Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Faculty College
Relationship; *Faculty Development; *Full Time
Faculty; Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional
Improvement; Needs Assessment; Questionnaires;
Released Time; State Surveys; Teacher Attitudes;
Teacher Improvement; Two Year Colleges

IDENTIFIERS *Washington

ABSTRACT

In response to reduced state funding for faculty development in community colleges in Washington, the Faculty Association of Community Colleges and the State Board for Community College Education established a special committee in 1989 to make recommendations to enhance faculty development efforts at the 27 community colleges statewide. To determine faculty development needs, the committee surveyed the state's 2,684 full-time faculty to determine specific development needs, the degree of faculty interest in certain content areas, and the best methods for delivering faculty development activities. Study findings, based on a 70% response rate, included the following: (1) the highest interest area for all faculty regardless of their discipline, level of experience, gender or region, was development activities for working with students (e.g., making goals and requirements clear, encouraging independent thought, and demonstrating interest in learning); (2) about 75% of the faculty in all disciplines expressed high interest in 6 of the other 25 faculty development topics (i.e., instructional methods, critical thinking, use of computers, use of technology in teaching, articulation with universities, and gaining expertise in a specific field); (3) faculty expressed the most interest in local workshops or individualized development activities (81% of the respondents were likely to participate in release time activities); and (4) barriers to participation included limited time and funding, and undesirable locations of activities. The survey instrument, with numerical and percentage results for each question, is included. (JMC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED325171

WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SURVEY RESULTS

A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF SURVEY OF ALL FULL-TIME FACULTY

NOVEMBER 1990

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Bell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

LORETTA SEPPANEN
STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION
319 - 7TH AVENUE, MS: FF-11
OLYMPIA WA 98504
206-753-3685

INTRODUCTION

Community colleges were required to significantly limit funding for faculty development in the early 1980s due to cuts in state support for higher education. Colleges have had little opportunity to increase funding since that time. In 1988-89 community colleges budgeted an average of about \$108 per faculty member for development, including travel costs.

The Faculty Association of Community Colleges, the Instruction Commission and staff of the State Board for Community College Education (SBCCE) assembled a committee in 1989 to address faculty professional development. That group made recommendations for a program of activities which would enhance faculty development across the state.

The first step of the program called for determining faculty development needs, the degree of faculty interest in specific content areas, and the best methods for delivering faculty development activities. This report summarizes findings from a survey developed by that committee to determine faculty needs.

The next step in the program was to share results of the survey with 67 representatives from the 27 community college. This was done at the November 7, 1990 Faculty Development Conference where college-based teams met with others from their geographic area to plan regional development activities. The SBCCE granted each region \$2,500 to carry out the development activities planned at that meeting.

As the effort to enhance faculty development moves to the third step, articulation between community college and four-year faculty, the effort continues to draw on the survey findings.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Highest Interest Area: Faculty were interested in one subject above all others regardless of their discipline, level of experience, gender, or region:

- * Working with Students: Making goals and requirements clear, encouraging independent thought, demonstrating interest in learning.

Next Top Six Interest Areas: About three out of four full-time community college faculty in all disciplines expressed a high level of interest in six of the other 25 potential faculty development topics:

- * Instructional Methods: Selecting appropriate techniques and being effective in lecture, group discussions, demonstrations, etc.

- * **Critical Thinking:** Training in special courses in critical thinking.
- * **Use of Computers:** Knowing how to use computers for faculty word processing and class rosters.
- * **Technology in Teaching:** Using video, computers, laser discs, etc, in the classroom or in reaching the distant learner.
- * **College Articulation:** Sharing ideas and exploring concepts with university colleagues.
- * **Technical Expertise:** Acquiring the subject area specific technical knowledge and skills required of a teacher.

Preferred Approaches to Faculty Development: Full-time faculty preferred local workshops or individualized faculty development activities:

- * 91 percent were likely to participate in local workshops.
- * 81 percent were likely to participate in release time.
- * 76 percent were likely to take courses.
- * 74 percent were likely to participate in regional meetings.

Barriers to Participation: Limited time and funding and undesirable locations of activities were listed as barriers to faculty development participation by a majority of respondents.

STUDY DESIGN

The survey instrument was designed by a special committee consisting of Ron Crossland, SBCCE staff; Judy Gray, Seattle District; Barbara Guillard, Big Bend; Julie Hungar, Seattle District; Wayne McGuire, Shoreline, and Gerald Perryman, Yakima Valley. The instrument was distributed on September 22, 1989 to all full-time faculty at each of the 27 community colleges. Responses received by October 25, 1989 are described in this report.

The five-page survey instrument listed 25 development activities. Faculty were asked to indicate their level of interest in participating in each activity. Another section requested faculty to specify which of seven types of development approaches they would prefer and to specify if funding or location would be a barrier to participation. Respondents were also asked to make general recommendations to the Faculty Development Committee.

Background information was also collected for use in analyzing the results by discipline, years of experience and gender.

About 70 percent of the 2,684 full-time faculty completed the survey. SBCCE staff completed the data entry and analysis of the 1,888 responses. Responses were analyzed for the five planning regions as well as by the background

characteristics. Response rates by region were similar. Women faculty were slightly more likely to respond to the survey than men faculty. The responses were judged to be representative of all full-time faculty in the community college system in 1989.

The percent of respondents in each of the five planning regions are listed in Table I along with the background characteristics of the respondents and thus of full-time community college faculty in general.

TABLE I
Characteristics of Fall 1989
Faculty Development Survey Respondents

	Percent of Total
Respondents by Regions	
1: Spokane, Wenatchee, Big Bend	14%
2: Columbia Basin, Yakima, Walla Walla	13%
3: Whatcom, Skagit, Everett, Edmonds, Shoreline, Peninsula	19%
4: Seattle, Highline, Green River, Bellevue, Olympic	29%
5: Clark, Lower Columbia, Grays Harbor, South Puget Sound, Tacoma, Pierce Centralia	25%
Respondents by Gender	
Male	58%
Female	42%
Respondents by Years of Post-Secondary Teaching Experience	
3 years or less	7%
4 to 10 years	22%
More than 10 years	71%
Respondents by Discipline (78 percent responded)	
Humanities	22%
Math and Natural Sciences	18%
Business, Accounting, Office, Data Processing	14%
Trades, Services, Technical	13%
Allied Health	11%
Social Sciences	9%
Library, Counselor, Physical Education	9%
Developmental Studies/Basic Skills	4%

FACULTY INTEREST IN POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

For faculty in all disciplines across the state, interest was greatest in development activities related to working with students. About 57 percent of all faculty were "very interested" in that topic and another 20 percent were "somewhat interested."

Six topics tied for the next level of faculty interest with about 45 percent of all faculty "very interested" and 30 percent "somewhat interested." Those topics were: instructional methods, critical thinking, use of computers, use of technology in teaching, articulation with universities and gaining expertise in a specific field ("technical expertise").

Five additional topics were of interest to about two-thirds of the respondents (about 30 percent "very interested" and 40 percent "somewhat interested"):

Sharing Knowledge: Assisting in the development of others, mentoring new interns or faculty.

Course Development: Taking a related set of skills and being able to construct a course which will effectively teach that set of skills.

Curriculum Development: Determining what skills are required of students and constructing or modifying curriculum to meet community needs.

Classroom-Based Research: Using classroom results to determine future directions for teaching.

Measuring Learning Outcomes: Deciding how to measure learning. Designing tests. Developing performance standards.

Difference by Discipline: There were some differences in the level of interest in these top topics by discipline. The 22 percent of respondents in the humanities disciplines were more interested than others in sharing knowledge with 82 percent "very or somewhat interested." They also were interested in a topic which did not rank among the top 12 topic areas for other faculty:

Alternative Curricula: Training in use of learning communities, coordinated studies, and other alternatives.

Humanities faculty: 77 percent very or somewhat interested.

Other faculty: 57 percent very or somewhat interested.

The 11 percent of respondents from the allied health disciplines were more interested than others in development activities related to measuring learning outcomes with 83 percent "very or somewhat interested."

Developmental and basic skills faculty, a group comprising only four percent of the total, were more interested in all topics than other faculty. Besides a high degree of interest in development related to working with students, they expressed high levels of interest in sharing knowledge, alternative curricula, curriculum development and classroom-based research.

Most faculty in math and natural science (74 percent), business and office (82 percent), and trades and technology (76 percent) were "very interested" in acquiring technical expertise. That compared to 61 percent of other faculty.

Differences by Region: Faculty in the five areas of the state rated the top interest areas almost identically.

Differences by Years of Experience: About 7 in 10 Washington community college faculty have been teaching in higher education for more than ten years. Their interests in enhanced professional development reflect that experience and differ somewhat from the interests of new teachers.

Faculty who had taught less than four years were more likely to be interested in all of the faculty development topics. Still they ranked the topics about the same as more experienced faculty. The only difference was that those with less than four years teaching experience said they were just as interested in "instructional method" as they were in "working with students." More experienced faculty were somewhat less interested in methods.

Faculty with less than four years experience expressed moderate interest in two areas not as highly ranked by faculty in general:

Advising: Identifying a proper course of study to meet a student's needs.
Understanding the use and importance of assessment scores. Transfer curriculum advising for each university.

Less than 4 Years:	67 percent very or somewhat interested
4 to 10 Years:	65 percent very or somewhat interested
More than 10 Years:	58 percent very or somewhat interested

Community Contacts/Cooperative Education: Knowing how to place students at training sites, understanding the role of various community groups, being able to call on community resources to assist the program.

Less than 4 Years:	65 percent very or somewhat interested
4 to 10 Years:	55 percent very or somewhat interested
More than 10 Years:	46 percent very or somewhat interested

Difference by Gender: Women faculty in Washington community colleges have fewer years of teaching experience than do male faculty (see Table II). That difference, in part, explains the response differences between male and female respondents. In general women faculty were more interested in faculty development activities.

There were no survey items on which male faculty expressed more interest than females, though the interest level was identical on about half the items. While the same seven topic areas were of highest and next to highest interest to both men and women, women ranked the following areas as moderately of interest while men did not:

TABLE II
Years of Post-Secondary Teaching Experience
By Faculty Gender

	Males	Females
3 years or less	7%	9%
4 to 10 years	20%	25%
More than 10 years	74%	65%

Using Models for Diverse Students: Using successful models working with diverse student populations.

Women: 72 percent very or somewhat interested
Men: 58 percent very or somewhat interested

International Studies: Integrating international approaches and culture into curricula.

Women: 72 percent very or somewhat interested
Men: 56 percent very or somewhat interested

Alternative Curricula: Training in use of learning communities, coordinated studies, and other alternatives.

Women: 70 percent very or somewhat interested
Men: 53 percent very or somewhat interested

Writing Across the Curriculum: Training in approaches to implementing writing across the curriculum.

Women: 68 percent very or somewhat interested
Men: 58 percent very or somewhat interested

Other Interests: Four themes ran through the many comments on other faculty development interests.

- * Activities which help faculty remain current in their field.
- * Meeting with colleagues, both in the field and across disciplines, statewide and nationally.
- * Information on student learning processes.
- * Multi-cultural teaching approaches.

Disinterested Faculty: About three percent of the respondents were disinterested in all 25 potential topics. It is reasonable to assume that five to ten percent of faculty at any given institution would have little interest in professional development activities.

PREFERRED APPROACHES FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Faculty were asked to indicate if they would likely participate in any of seven types of faculty development activities. While the majority are likely to participate in any type of development activity if it is a topic of interest, faculty expressed the most interest in local workshops and release time for development as shown in Table III.

TABLE III
Percent Likely to Participate by Type of Activity

<u>Type</u>	<u>Percent Likely to Participate</u>
Local Workshops	91%
Release Time	81%
Courses	76%
Regional Workshops	74%
Sabbaticals	68%
Statewide Meetings	62%
Teleconferences	54%

Courses for University Credit: About two-thirds of the respondents were "very or somewhat interested" in courses for university credit. Less experienced faculty and women faculty were more interested in university credit than others (85 percent and 76 percent respectively). Faculty in Region 2, southeast and central Washington, were more interested (79 percent) in university credit than those in other regions.

Differences by Region: Faculty in Regions 3 and 4, the Seattle area and northwest Washington, favored local workshops and sabbaticals the most. About 60 percent of the faculty in eastern Washington said they would participate in teleconferences.

Difference by Discipline: Though about 80 percent of social science and humanities faculty were likely to participate in local workshops, they had the least interest in that approach to faculty development.

Faculty in disciplines most interested in courses were generally less interested in sabbaticals and vice versa as shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV
Percent Likely to Participate in Courses and Sabbaticals by Discipline

<u>Discipline</u>	<u>Percent Likely to Participate in:</u>	
	<u>Courses</u>	<u>Sabbaticals</u>
Humanities	70%	82%
Social Science	66%	75%
Natural Science	73%	71%
Developmental/Basic Skills	76%	66%
Allied Health	85%	60%
Trades, Services, Technical	82%	62%
Business, Accounting, Office		
Data Processing	80%	62%
Library, Counseling, Physical		
Education	69%	50%

BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATING IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Both funding and location were seen as barriers to participation in development activities by the majority of respondents. About 79 percent said funding constraints would restrict their participation. Slightly fewer said location was a factor (65 percent) in participation. Location was more important for those in Seattle and northwest Washington than elsewhere. More women faculty than men said both funding and location were barriers to participation (funding: 85 percent versus 74 percent; location: 70 percent versus 62 percent).

Perhaps a more important barrier was addressed only in the comment section of the survey. That was the issue of time. Many faculty commented that lack of time was a major barrier to participation in development activities. Faculty expressed concerns about missing class, not finding a replacement for their courses, or attending meetings that would conflict with their non-work related activities.

OTHER FINDINGS

Most research leads to findings not directly related to the study goals. Such was the case in this study. The serendipitous findings of this research were related to differences in years of experience by discipline, sex, and region.

Experienced faculty are not found in equal numbers in all fields. About a third of the faculty in allied health; trades, services, technical; business related and developmental and basic skills had ten or fewer years teaching experience. Those same fields, with the exception of trades, services and technical programs, have faculties with the highest proportion of women as shown in Table V. The experience factor is also different by region with the Puget Sound area and Northwest Washington having the most experienced faculty. The experience-gender factor was not evident between regions.

TABLE V
Percent of Faculty with More than Ten
Years Experience and Percent Male
by Discipline and Region

	Percent of Respondents	
	More than 10 Years Experience	Male
By Discipline		
Social Sciences	82%	76%
Math and Natural Sciences	80%	73%
Humanities	76%	54%
Library, Counselor, Physical Education	75%	46%
Developmental Studies/Basic Skills	67%	32%
Business, Accounting, Office, Data Processing	64%	46%
Trades, Services, Technical	63%	84%
Allied Health	62%	23%
By Region		
1: Spokane, Wenatchee, Big Bend	65%	55%
2: Columbia Basin, Yakima, Walla Walla	64%	57%
3: Whatcom, Skagit, Everett, Edmonds, Shoreline, Peninsula	75%	55%
4: Seattle, Highline, Green River, Bellevue, Olympic	75%	58%
5: Clark, Lower Columbia, Grays Harbor South Puget Sound, Tacoma, Pierce	68%	63%
All respondents	72%	58%

CONCLUSION

Faculty identified seven potential development areas of high interest. Chief among these, with 87 percent of respondents "very or somewhat interested," was working with students -- making goals and requirements clear, encouraging independent thought and demonstrating interest in student learning. Also of high interest were instructional methods, critical thinking, use of computers, technology in teaching, college articulation and technical expertise.

Faculty favor local workshops for delivery of development activities but the majority would participate in any of the methods included in the survey. Time, funding and location all could serve as barriers to participation.

APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

WASHINGTON STATE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
SURVEY RESULTS

System Wide

November 1989

1,888 SURVEYS RETURNED **INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

All of the following are potential faculty development topics. Please indicate what your interest is in having an opportunity to participate in types of faculty development activities related to each area.

If you are interested in a development activity in the given area either at your campus or at a regional or state meeting of community college faculty, please select the degree of your interest.

(Please check the best response for each item)

	<u>Very Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Not Interested</u>	<u>Not Interested</u>
1. PROGRAM EVALUATION				
Determining if a program is meeting its goals.	468	763	349	268
Being able to decide if a course is unnecessary. Knowing how to use follow-up information to improve the program.	25%	41%	19%	15%
2. INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS				
Selecting appropriate techniques and being effective at lecture, group discussion, demonstrations, etc.	876	592	254	140
	47%	32%	14%	8%
3. COURSE DEVELOPMENT				
Taking a related set of skills and being able to construct a course which will effectively teach that set of skills.	587	703	354	207
	32%	38%	19%	11%
4. TECHNICAL EXPERTISE				
Acquiring the technical knowledge and skills required of a teacher in the field.	767	487	346	234
	42%	27%	19%	13%
5. OUTCOME MEASUREMENT				
Deciding how to measure actual learning. Designing tests. Developing performance standards.	550	712	364	227
	30%	38%	20%	12%
6. PROGRAM MARKETING				
Determining the target market, creating effective media, coordinating activities with other school offices.	447	495	461	446
	24%	27%	25%	24%
7. ADVISING				
Identifying a proper course of study to meet a student's needs. Understanding the use and importance of assessment scores. Transfer curriculum advising for each university.	437	676	467	282
	23%	36%	25%	15%
8. CERTIFICATION				
Understanding the certification requirements and standards. Knowing how to develop and use a professional improvement plan.	199	486	595	562
	11%	26%	32%	31%

Numbers may not add due to rounding

(Please check the best response for each item)

	<u>Very Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Not Interested</u>	<u>Not Interested</u>
9. COMMUNITY CONTACT/COOPERATIVE EDUC. Knowing how to place students at training sites, understanding the role of various community groups, being able to call on community resources to assist the program.	356 19%	545 30%	466 25%	462 25%
10. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT Determining what skills are required of students and constructing or modifying curriculum to meet community needs.	535 29%	740 40%	370 20%	188 10%
11. ADVISORY COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT Identifying who should be on the advisory committee, maximizing attendance, getting relevant input, reducing time waste.	291 16%	467 26%	536 29%	532 29%
12. WORKING WITH STUDENTS Making goals and requirements clear, encouraging independent thought, demonstrating interest in student learning.	1,041 57%	558 30%	146 8%	94 5%
13. SHARING KNOWLEDGE Assisting in the development of others, mentoring new interns or faculty.	607 33%	770 42%	298 16%	153 8%
14. USE OF COMPUTERS Knowing how to use for own wordprocessing and class roster.	813 44%	527 29%	250 14%	251 14%
15. SUCCESSFUL MODELS Using successful models working with diverse student populations.	447 25%	691 39%	432 24%	219 12%
16. RECEIPT OF UNIVERSITY CREDIT Receiving University credit for seminars, workshops, and activities.	755 41%	497 27%	273 15%	305 17%

17. Do you have any specific recommendations about any of the items you selected as very or somewhat interesting? (Please indicate the number of the item and comment).

18. Please indicate other individual development areas that it would be somewhat or very interesting for you to have an opportunity for professional development.

TRENDS IN INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The following are trends in instructional improvement in community colleges. Please indicate your interest in participating in development activities related to each of the areas. If you would be interested in participating in a development activity at your campus or at a regional or state meeting of faculty related to the area please select "Somewhat Interested" or "Very Interested."

(Please check the best response for each item)

	<u>Very Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Not Interested</u>	<u>Not Interested</u>
19. HIGH SCHOOL ARTICULATION Sharing ideas and exploring concepts with high school colleagues.	446 24%	731 40%	401 22%	263 14%
20. COLLEGE ARTICULATION Sharing ideas and exploring concepts with University colleagues.	756 41%	733 40%	244 13%	113 6%
21. TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING Using video, computers, laser discs, etc. in the classroom or in reaching the distant learner.	784 42%	642 35%	303 16%	124 7%
22. INTERNATIONAL STUDIES Integrating international approaches and cultures into curricula.	595 32%	560 30%	424 23%	267 14%
23. CLASSROOM BASED RESEARCH Using classroom results to determine future directions for your teaching.	492 27%	766 42%	390 21%	184 10%
24. WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM Training in approaches to implementing writing across the curriculum.	450 25%	669 37%	489 27%	216 12%
25. CRITICAL THINKING Training in special courses in critical thinking.	803 44%	608 33%	284 15%	139 8%
26. ALTERNATIVE CURRICULA Training in use of learning communities, coordinated studies, and other alternatives.	480 26%	605 33%	492 27%	236 13%
27. INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES Deciding how to measure learning from total college experience. Developing performance standards.	276 15%	654 36%	562 31%	316 17%

28. Do you have any specific recommendations about any of the items you selected as very or somewhat interesting? (Please indicate the number of the item and comment).

29. Please indicate other "new trends" areas that would be somewhat or very interesting for you to have an opportunity for professional development.

LOGISTICS

Typical formats for professional development includes:

Statewide or regional meetings
 Local workshops
 Teleconferences with national speakers from a specific field
 Courses
 Sabbatical Leave
 Release Time

Which of these formats are you most likely to find appropriate to your professional development needs?

(Please check the best response)

	<u>Likely To Participate</u>		<u>Not Likely to Participate</u>	
30. Statewide Meetings	1,084	62%	656	38%
31. Regional Meetings	1,310	74%	450	26%
32. Local Workshops	1,639	91%	155	9%
33. Teleconferences with national speakers in my field or interest area	910	53%	795	47%
34. Courses	1,321	76%	425	24%
35. Sabbatical Leave	1,183	68%	554	32%
36. Release Time	1,432	81%	332	19%
37. Would funding concerns impact your participation in the format(s) you chose above (assuming a subject of use to you)?	Yes, lack of additional funds would prevent participation		No, funding is not a factor	
	1,402	79%	375	21%

38. If you answered "Yes" for #37, please describe what additional funding you would need.

39. Would location impact your participation in the format(s) you chose above (assuming a subject of use to you)?	Yes, a poor location would prevent part- icipation		No, location is not a factor	
	1,151	65%	615	35%

40. If you answered "Yes" for #39, please indicate the locations which would be best for you.

41. What other logistics would impact your participating in faculty development activities?

ERIC Clearinghouse for
 Junior Colleges

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991